

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings correct the location of a portion of a drawing line in

FIG. 1.

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet (FIG. 1)
One (1) Annotated Sheet (FIG. 1)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In this Amendment After Final (“Amendment”), Applicant proposes to amend paragraph [0022] to correct a typographical error and to amend FIG. 1 to correct the location of a portion of a drawing line. No new matter is introduced.

No amendments are proposed in response to the Examiner’s provisional double patenting rejection or rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Prior to entry of the Amendment, claims 1-22 were pending in the application. After entry of the Amendment, claims 1-22 remain pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner provisionally rejected claim 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 56 of copending U.S. patent application No. 10/736,832 (“the ’832 application”); and rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,073,870 to Morita (“Morita”). The Examiner also allowed claims 1-15 and 17-22.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Allowed Claims

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner’s statement that claims 1-15 and 17-22 are allowed.

Examiner Interview

Applicant’s representative held a telephone interview with the Examiner on November 21, 2007. Items discussed included: the provisional rejection of claim 16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 56 of the ’832 application. No agreement with respect to the pending claims was reached.

Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings correct the location of a portion of a drawing line in FIG. 1.

Provisional Rejection

Based on a check of the Patent Application Information Retrieval (“PAIR”) system on December 3, 2007, claim 56 of the ’832 application has been withdrawn from consideration (as being drawn to a nonelected invention) in an Office Action mailed on October 15, 2007. As a result, Applicant requests that the Examiner hold in abeyance the provisional rejection for the present application until a Notice of Allowance is mailed for the ’832 application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Independent Claim 16

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Morita discloses: (a) receiving multiplicand A, modulus N, and multiplier B; and (b) performing carry save addition on at least four inputs related to multiplicand A, modulus N, and multiplier B (using first full adder 65 and second full adder 67—both part of carry save adder 63) to generate a result in redundant representation. Final Office Action, p. 4, § 6.

The Examiner also admits that Morita does not disclose performing carry propagation addition using second full adder 67 to generate a result in normal representation in response to a carry propagation adder signal. Id., p. 4, § 7.

However, the Examiner further alleges: (c) that Morita discloses carry propagation adder 39 is used to perform carry propagation addition to generate a result in normal representation in response to a carry propagation adder signal; and (d) that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize carry propagation adder 39 as second full adder 67 in carry save adder 63 to generate a result in normal representation. Id., p. 5, § 7.

Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a proper prima facie case of obviousness for at least the following four reasons.

First, Morita does not disclose a carry propagation adder signal. Nor has the Examiner identified such a signal. In fact, Morita does not appear to disclose any signal (other than data transfers).

Second, the carry propagation adder signal of the present invention causes a shift between performing carry save addition using first full adder unit 171 and second full adder unit 175 and performing carry propagation addition using second full adder unit 175. In contrast, Applicant submits that Morita discloses a sequential relationship between carry save adder 37 and carry propagation adder 39. Thus, Morita does not disclose shifting between carry save adder 37 and carry propagation adder 39, further evidence that Morita does not disclose a carry propagation adder signal.

Third, the Examiner's disingenuous statement, "this is not explicitly shown as the same 'second full adder unit' as used in the carry save addition" Id. (emphasis added), belies what Morita does explicitly show—a sequential relationship between carry save adder 37 and carry propagation adder 39, a correspondence between carry save adder 37 and carry save adder 63 (including first full adder 65 and second full adder 67), and thus that carry save adder 37 is not the same as second full adder 67.

Fourth, the Examiner's allegation that Morita discloses performing carry save addition using second full adder 67 to generate a result in redundant representation contradicts the Examiner's allegation that it would be obvious to utilize carry propagation adder 39 as second full adder 67 to generate a result in normal representation.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that independent claim 16 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Morita and the other art of record.

Request for Reconsideration and Allowance

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-22 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; in particular, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, Dickey, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
703.668.8000

JAC/LFG



FIG. 1

